

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 14, 1997

will tend to ensure a uniform application of a rule. But if the rule is bad, it should not be enforced at all. So that part I'm not going to try to change, I will discuss the rule. If you adopt this rule it will never come into play if I ask for a call of the house before a vote goes up on the board. The only thing that can be hoped then is that Senator Withem's advice will be followed and more people will vote no than yes. But that is a tactic which can come back to bite if we have one of those days when many of the senators are feeding at the lobbyists trough and an attempt is made by the point person or look-out to call the house when something important comes and we don't grant it anymore as a courtesy. And those of us who stay here and outnumber the point person who's watching out for those who are sumptuously dining at the trough of the lobbyists, you won't get the call of the house. And even though your votes are somewhere, they won't be cast. Maybe that would never happen. But a rule can cut both ways. We ought to name every one of our rules Janus, that's the creature that had a face in the front and a face in the back so it could see the future and the past, see things coming and going. And, Senator Schimek, what it missed with a forethought it would get with an afterthought, if you know what I mean. And a lot of times an afterthought is necessary here. And they say dinosaurs had two brains, one in the head and one in the back of part of their body. For real, two brains. But if you put them both together they were the size of the walnut, for real. But I guess there was a lot of activity going on in it. First of all, the only time this rule can possibly come into play is if a vote has been taken. In the absence of a vote having gone upon the board a call of the house cannot be declared out of order under this rule. Why should we, on something which on occasion can be so essential, place it within the discretion of the President to rule it out of order when it's something we vote on and we can just vote no. If a majority of those here want to put the house under call, why should the chairperson, in his or her discretion, be able to forecast how we're going to vote and say that motion is out of order? A chairperson could know that enough people would vote to place the house under call, even if on the surface all of those who haven't voted and are not in the Chamber would vote on the small side, wouldn't be enough to bring it up to overcome the prevailing side. The majority of people here may still want to put the house under call. Why? Because people change their